

University of Groningen

To Justifie the Wayes of God to Men

van Wolferen, Marinus Johan

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

2018

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

van Wolferen, M. J. (2018). *To Justifie the Wayes of God to Men: Limits to the court's powers of interpretation*. [Thesis fully internal (DIV), University of Groningen]. University of Groningen.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Statements for Discussion

- 1) Concepts of public interest litigation originating in legal orders other than the EU one are not helpful for discussing public interest litigation in the EU. (Chapter 3, section 3.5)
- 2) Today's calls to change the EU conception of standing is based on an development in constitutional relations that is not mirrored in the development of the EU conception of standing. (Chapter 3)
- 3) Criticism on the Court of Justice's interpretation to standing have been focussed on the outcome of individual cases, without taking into account the manner in which the system has been developed. (Chapter 3, section 3.2)
- 4) So far, the Treaty Makers explicitly meant to limit the Court of Justice in its interpretation of standing requirements. (Chapter 3, section 3.3; Chapter 4 section 4.3; Chapter 5, section 5.3)
- 5) Developments in the EU system for judicial protection are hindered by the hitherto unclear distinction between acts of a legislative nature and acts of an administrative nature. (Chapter 4, section 4.3.2)
- 6) International (mixed) agreements are unsuitable as instruments for changes in EU primary law. (Chapter 5, section 5.4)
- 7) The European legal order is increasingly moving towards a federal system of judicial protection. (Chapter 6, section 6.3.2)
- 8) Wishing for a specific interpretation, also when based on morally valid points, does not necessarily make it valid law. (Chapter 6, section 6.2)
- 9) There is a well-functioning and complete system of remedies within the European Union, even for public interest litigants. (Chapter 6, section 6.5)
- 10) The role for public interest litigants in the development of the EU system for judicial protection is to assure for a greater robustness of access to justice at national level. (Conclusion)
- 12) Any administration should fill its key positions with those who are reluctant to take up the mantle, and should fire those who are too eager to clad themselves in ermine.
- 13) The enormous disparity between the number of students enrolling for an engineering degree, and the enrolment figures for a law degree, proves that people do not want to solve today's problems, they want to complain about them.